

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-10 and 12-21 are pending in the above-identified application. Claim 11 is cancelled.

Claims 13 was objected to for an informality. This informality has been corrected.

Claims 1-7, 9, 13, 18-19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being unpatentable over Weizorek et al. Claim 1 is amended to include, "...the circuit board is out of **direct contact** with the case." (Emphasis added). Basis for these amendments may be found in the specification, for example, at page 9, lines 6-19 and Figs. 3-5.

With regard to claim 1, Wiezorek et al. does not disclose or suggest a circuit board that is "...out of **direct contact** with the case." Wiezorek et al. includes a control circuit 8 and a housing part 2. (Fig. 6). The Examiner asserts that the housing part 2 in Wiezorek et al. is equivalent to Applicants' case 15. (Page 3, line 20). The Examiner also asserts that the processor hybrid 8 is equivalent to Applicants' control circuit portion 8. (Page 3, line 10). As shown in Fig. 6, however, the bottom surface of the control circuit 8 touches housing part 2. Thus, the control circuit 8 in Wiezorek et al. is in **direct contact** with housing part 2.

The exemplary embodiment of Applicant's invention includes a circuit board 20 and a case 15 (housing part). (Figs. 3 and 4). In contrast to Wiezorek et al., the circuit board 20 is "...out direct contact with case 15." Heat radiator 23 is fixed to lower case 15 (a). The circuit board 20 is coupled to the heat radiator 23. The circuit board 20 is not fixed to lower case 15(a). That is, the outer peripheral surfaces 20(a)-20(d) of the circuit board 20 are kept in a free state in lower case 15(a). (Page 9, lines 6-19). Thus, the circuit board 20 is kept "...out of **direct contact**" with lower case 15(a). Applicants' claimed feature of "...the circuit board is out of **direct contact** with the case" is advantageous over the prior art because stress is not applied on soldering portions of the circuit components mounted on circuit board 20 if loads of thermal expansion and contraction vibration are applied. Thus, reliability can be expected to be improved.



Claims 2-7, 9, 13, 18-19 and 21 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-7, 9, 13, 18-19 and 21 are also allowable over the art of record.

Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Weizorek et al. and Selgin. These claims are, however, allowable by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Claims 12, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Weizorek et al. These claims are, however, allowable by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Weizorek et al. and Nakajima et al. These claims are, however, allowable by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, likely belonging to Lawrence E. Ashery, the attorney for applicants.

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/dfd/bj/ds

Dated: June 8, 2007

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

June 8, 2007

Deborah Spratt A handwritten signature in black ink, likely belonging to Deborah Spratt, the Commissioner for Patents.

ds/131456